CHURCH RECORD.

A Weekly Paper, devoted chiefly to the cause of Christianity and Education.

VOL. I. FLUSHING, N. Y., FEBRUARY 27, 1841. NO. 14.

THE CHURCH RECORD.

FRANCIS L. HAWKS, D. D.,
PROPRIETOR AND EDITOR.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING, BY CHARLES R. LINCOLN, FLUSHING, N. Y.

TERMS—Three Dollars per annum, in advance.

Historical.

CONSTITUTION AND CANONS OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

[CONTINUED FOM PAGE 114.]

CANON XVIII.

OF THE PREPARATORY EXERCISES OF A CANDIDATE FOR PRIESTS' ORDERS.

1808. A candidate for Priests' orders shall, before his ordination, be required to undergo an examination in presence of the Bishop, and as many Presbyters as can conveniently be convened, on those leading books in the course of study prescribed by the House of Bishops, which he may have omitted in his preparation for Deacons' orders.

In 1832, this was altered as follows:—

1832. A candidate for Priests' orders shall, before his ordination, be required to undergo an examination in presence of the Bishop, and two or more Presbyters, to be named by him; on any leading studies prescribed by the House of Bishops.

CANON XIX.

OF THE TITLES OF THOSE WHO ARE TO BE ORDAINED PRIESTS.

It is a rule of great antiquity in the Church, that none should be ordained a priest or deacon, who had not first some certain place where he might exercise his function. A canon to this effect, may be found as far back, as the council of Chalcedon, Anno 451: and the rule was continued in the Church of England, when the reformation took place:* In 1789, the first canon was made in our Church on this subject in these words:

1789. No person shall be ordained either deacon or priest, unless he shall produce a satisfactory certificate from some church, parish, or congregation that he is engaged with them, and that they will receive him as their minister, and allow him a reasonable support; or unless he be engaged as a professor, tutor, or instructor of youth, in some college, academy, or general seminary of learning, duly incorporated; or unless the Standing Committee of the church in the State for which he is to be ordained, shall certify to the Bishop their full belief and expectation that he will be received and settled as a pastor, by some one of the vacant churches in that State.

At the revision of the Canons in 1808, this law was retained so far as it concerned priests.

1808. No person shall be ordained Priest, unless he shall produce a satisfactory certificate from some Church, parish, or congregation, that he is engaged with them, and that they will receive him as their Minister, and allow him a reasonable support; or unless he be engaged as a professor, tutor, or instructor of youth, in some college, academy, or general seminary of learning, duly incorporated; or unless the Standing Committee of the Church in the State for which he is to be ordained, shall certify to the Bishop their full belief and expectation that he will be received and settled as a Pastor by some one of the vacant Churches in that State.

In 1832, it was further altered and now stands as follows:—

1832. No person shall be ordained Priest, unless he shall produce to the Bishop a satisfactory certificate from some church, parish, or congregation, that he is engaged with them, and that they will receive him as their Minister, or unless he be a missionary under the ecclesiastical authority of the Diocese to which he belongs; or in the employment of some missionary society recognised by the General Convention; or unless he be engaged as a professor, tutor, or instructer of youth, in some college, academy, or other seminary of learning, duly incorporated.

CANON XX.

OF THE TIMES OF ORDINATION.

According to the learned author of the Ecclesiastical Antiquities, it would seem, that *during the first three centuries*, there was not any rule or practice, restricting ordinations to four particular periods of the year:* the practice, however, afterward obtained, of setting aside the *jejunia quatuor temporum*, the fasts of the four seasons of the year, commonly called Ember weeks, as the regular seasons of ordination.

In the canons of the English church, made, Anno 1603, the ember weeks are appointed to be the proper times for conferring orders: and in a preamble to the law appointing them, it is very confidently asserted, that the apostles themselves furnish the precedent; a matter as some suppose, more easily affirmed than proved.

In imitation of the Mother Church, without however needlessly committing herself to the questionable point of *apostolic* usage, our branch of the Church in America, by canon in 1789, adopted also the ember weeks as the stated times of ordination. In our canon, however, it is said that we are following the example of the *primitive church*: and if by that phrase, be meant the Christians of the first three centuries, there is, as we have already stated, some who believe that our declaration is incorrect. Probably the language of the English canon, (which it is obvious, on comparison, was before the writer of ours) led to the use of the word *primitive* by our fathers.

1789. Agreeably to the practice of the primitive church, the stated times of ordination shall be on the Sundays following the Ember weeks; viz. the second Sunday in Lent, the feast of Trinity, and the Sundays after the Wednesdays following the fourteenth day of September, and the thirteenth of December.

We needed clergymen so much, that whatever may have been the practice of the primitive church, ours always was to ordain clergymen whenever fit persons presented themselves; and it may well be questioned whether a candidate duly qualified and ready for orders was ever postponed by an American bishop for the coming on of Ember week. In fact, so little were these seasons regarded as being exclusively the times of ordination, that it was thought best to give express legal sanction to the practice which prevailed among the bishops, of ordaining at any time. Under the canon as it stood, they probably had the right, to ordain when they pleased, for the appointment of stated seasons, did not necessarily exclude occasional ones; but the matter was set at rest in 1808, by a positive enactment.

*Gibson's Codex, 161. Bingham, Lib iv., Ch. 6.

Bingham, Lib. iv., Ch. 6.

1808. Agreeably to the practice of the primitive church the stated times of ordination shall be on the Sundays following the Ember weeks, viz:—the second Sunday in Lent, the feast of Trinity, and the Sundays after the Wednesdays following the 14th day of September, and the 13th of December. Occasional ordinations may be held at such other times as the Bishop shall appoint.

In the revision of 1832, this canon was adopted *verbatim*, and is now the law of the church: and we cannot but remark, that when the inconvenience of being confined to stated periods, was so sensibly brought home to our own church by experience, it is a little strange that some suspicion should not have arisen of similar inconvenience in the primitive church, when ministers were as we may believe, much needed, and that some investigation should not thence have been made into the existence, or non-existence, of any such usage in the earliest times. It would have been found we believe, that prior to the year 450, presbyters and deacons were ordained *at all times* as the occasions of the church required, and that there were then no stated periods of ordination.

—

CANON XXI.

OF THOSE WHO HAVE OFFICIATED AS MINISTERS AMONG OTHER DENOMINATIONS OF CHRISTIANS, AND APPLY FOR ORDERS IN THIS CHURCH.

Applications for admission into the ministry of the church, from those who had been ordained in other denominations, were of rare occurrence in our early history. The effect of the American revolution upon the church, had been to attach to it, no small share of odium, and few cared to enrol themselves among the clergy of a communion, small in numbers, and the object also of popular dislike. Prejudice too, served to perpetuate ignorance of the opinions, and views of the Episcopal Church, (or as it was then more usually called, the Church of England:) and without inquiry, many cast a suspicious glance at a church, which was not horror-stricken at the bare thought of the prelatical abomination of bishops: and considered her as nothing less than the legitimate offspring of that naughty mother, "the scarlet lady that sitteth on the seven hills."

No law upon the subject was made, for none was necessary, until 1804.

1804. When a minister of any other denomination, of Christians shall apply for orders in this church, the Bishop to whom application is made, being satisfied that he is a man of piety and unexceptionable character, that he holds the doctrines of the church, and that he possesses all the literary and other qualifications required, and being furnished with testimonials from the Standing Committee duly convened, may ordain him as soon as is convenient. In all such cases, the Standing Committee may insert in their testimonials the words, "we believe him to be sincerely attached to the doctrines and discipline of the Protestant Episcopal Church," instead of the words, "and hath not written, taught, or held any thing contrary to the doctrine or discipline of the Protestant Episcopal Church."

This law permitted two things: first, it gave to the applicant the privilege of *immediate* ordination, while other candidates were then required to be such at least one year: and secondly, it allowed a change of phraseology in the testimonial of the Standing Committee: but it did not dispense with any thing else, which was required of other candidates; it demanded fair character, piety, attachment to the doctrines of the church, and *all the literary qualifications.*

The next canon on the subject was the seventeenth of 1808.

1808. When any person who has officiated as minister among any other denomination of Christians, shall apply for orders in this church, the Bishop to whom application is made, being satisfied on examination according to the Canons that he is a man of piety and unexceptionable character, that he holds the doctrines of the Church, and that he possesses *all* the literary and other qualifications required, and being furnished with testimonials from the Standing Committee duly convened, may ordain him as soon as is convenient. In all such cases the Standing Committee may insert in their testimonials the words "we believe him to be sincerely attached to the doctrines and discipline of the Protestant Episcopal Church," instead of the words, "and hath not written, taught, or held any thing contrary to the doctrine or discipline of the Protestant Episcopal Church."

The change made by this canon in the former law, consists principally in the requirement, that the bishop shall be satisfied respecting the candidate, "*on examination according to the canons.*" From this we may infer, that, under the former canon, the bishop might satisfy himself in some other mode. There is, however, to be remarked, that neither under this, nor the former law, was there any relaxation of the demand for *all* the literary and other qualifications, [except under the dispensing power granted to the Bishop, and Standing Committee, as already placed before the reader, under Canon XIII of our volume:] so that all candidates whether they had been ministers of other denominations or not, had to pass through the same process, in obtaining orders without full qualifications.

The next laws touching this matter were Canons IV and V of 1820.

1820. Canon IV. In the case of a minister of some other denomination of Christians applying for holy orders in this church, the Standing Committee may receive testimonials of his piety, good morals, and orderly conduct from twelve members of the denomination from which he came: provided the members of the Committee have such confidence in the persons thus testifying, as to satisfy them of the correctness of the testimony: and also a testimonial to the same effect from at least one clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

1820. Canon V. When any person, not a citizen of the United States, who has officiated as a minister among any other denomination of Christians, shall apply for orders in this church, the Bishop to whom application is made, shall require of him, (in addition to the qualifications made necessary by the seventeenth canon [of 1808]) satisfactory evidence that he has resided at least one year in the United States, previous to his application.

Previous to the enactment of this fourth Canon, a candidate from another denomination, was obliged to lay before the Standing Committee, precisely such testimonials as were required of those who were, and long had been perhaps, Episcopalians: and these, it will be remembered were, under the Canons, to be signed by Episcopalians. Hence one from another denomination, could scarcely avoid the difficulty, naturally arising from the fact, that those who best knew him, would belong to the denomination he was leaving, and not to that into which he was entering. He was therefore permitted to procure a testimonial from his former acquaintance, though they might not be Episcopalians; but the Standing Committee were required to satisfy themselves, that the individuals testifying, were worthy of confidence; and "to make assurance doubly sure," a testimonial was also required from some respectable clergyman of the church.

Another change in existing laws was made by Canon V. The Bishop before this time, had power to ordain a candidate from another denomination, immediately after he had passed the committee, if he saw fit to do so: but here it was provided, very wisely, that if the applicant were a foreigner, he should reside at least one year in this country, before his ordination: a time short enough, it will be thought by most, in which to acquire a knowledge of the habits of mind, and peculiarities of manner necessary to be understood by him who would be useful as a clergyman.

In all other particulars the old law remained untouched.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

Education.

[*For the Church Record.*]

REMARKS ON POPULAR EDUCATION.

NUMBER IV.

ITS IRRELIGIOUS CHARACTER.—CONTINUED.

In my last number I offered evidence to show that our common school system was such, as to render it expedient, as necessary, in the opinion of the public, to exclude all religious instruction. I now proceed to show, that what is true in this particular of the common schools, is also true of our private schools and colleges. From this remark, are to be excepted, those institutions known and declared to be under the control of some religious denomination, or of some individual or individuals, who have, without qualification, made the religion of the Gospel, the basis of their systems of education.

Of all others, then, it may be remarked, in the first place, that though religion is not formally ex-

pelled, it is nevertheless deemed expedient to declare with distinct emphasis, that nothing "*sectarian*" shall be taught. This declaration, as we shall see, places them at once in the condition of the common schools, when it is found to possess such an expulsive power as to operate to the utter exclusion of religion, as a distinct element, from the whole mass of instruction. It is because of the variety and jealousy of the religious sects, that the public anthorities can allow no definite religious instruction in the public schools; and when private institutions are open to all sects, with a declaration of principles precisely like that of the common schools," nothing sectarian," or "all religion in general, and none in particular," must not precisely similar results be expected? Let us suppose, now, the doors of an institution thrown open to all religious denominations—the influence and patronage of all denominations solicited—its broad and Catholic principle stated, "*Religion—but nothing contrary to the opinions of any religious sect.*" The professor or teacher, finds before him the representatives of every religious denomination; he is about to give them religious instruction: he recollects that nothing "sectarian" can be introduced. He must confine himself to "general principles." He opens the Bible to read; but the *Roman Catholic* is there, and he objects to it as being "sectarian."* He attempts to offer audible prayer; but the *Quaker* is present, and considers it a violation of the spirit of liberty to require him to join.† Or suppose that, notwithstanding the prejudices of the Roman Catholic, he does open the Bible; and allowing that he finds nothing, in his opinion, necessary to be taught, that shall not find entire acceptance with the Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, &c.; and he proceeds, therefore, to state the facts, or enforce a duty from an acknowledgement of the facts, of our entire depravity and ruin, redemption by the blood of Christ, the necessity of regeneration by the Holy Ghost, &c., will he not find in the "Unitarian" an objector to all these statements, and to all the inferences he may draw from them? Or suppose that, passing by all these great truths, as unnecessary to be taught, he turns to the Divine commands and precepts, and says "Thou shalt not lie, thou shalt not steal," &c., here surely is common ground, for these are gross crimes, and punishable by the state. He therefore may urge these precepts with all the emphasis of an honest man, who has declared that he will teach religion, but teach nothing sectarian. He urges these precepts and commands, therefore, not accompanied by the feeble sanctions of human law, but by the tremendous sanctions of a future retribution. He tells his pupils, that if they break these commands, God will punish them hereafter and forever. But, alas! even these great principles cannot be *thus* enforced, for the *Universalist* denies these "future retributions," and makes the denial of them the characteristic mark of his sect. What then shall the man do? What *can* he do, who declares that he will teach religion, but teach nothing "sectarian," and means to be *honest* in this avowal? I say that such a position *must* exclude all religion, and make our private institutions what our common schools are—nurseries of impiety and infidelity. If it be now said that these are only *theoretical* difficulties, and that practically there are none at all, in teaching religion on the broad principle of an universal "eclecticism," I would reply, in the second place, that it is precisely in the *practical* operation of the principle that the evil of it is most manifest. Where, for instance, is the institution depending for its support upon all denominations of Christians, that in the present vitiated state of public sentiment upon this subject, would *dare* to appropriate as much time *daily*, to direct *religious* culture as it does to *mental?* Where is the institution, that would venture to give as much prominence in its "course of study" to the *Bible*, as it does to mathematics or language? Instead of finding the difficulty in the *theory* on this subject, it is a fact, that almost all our schools do *profess* the most sacred regard for religious instruction, while they *practically* treat it as the most insignificant item in their whole system, and totally expel it from the circle of studies. I appeal to those who know the actual amount of religious instruction in our private schools, academies, and colleges—the graduates of these institutions—whether the religion of the New Testament is not as really excluded from the daily course of study, as it has been shown to be in the common schools? The writer graduated at one of our New-England colleges, the president and professors of which, with one exception, were *clergymen:* a college whose religious character stands as high, I suppose, as any in the country. *And he recollects no one exercise that he was required by law to attend, except the prayers and Sabbath exercises, that had any connexion with his spiritual interests.* The only text-boooks that had aught to do with religion, were "Butler's Analogy," and Edwards on the Will." There was, during the four years of college life, every day of which, we spent some hours in the recitation room with a *clerical* professor, *but one hour* in all that time occupied in giving us spiritual or moral instruction, in the room and hour of recitation. And this was so unusual, that the professor deemed an apology necessary for detaining the class for a purpose apparently so "foreign to the design" of college instruction. And yet, in the excellent remarks then made, he said, (and the observation showed at once the necessity and the destitution of the conservative influence of religious instruction in our public institutions) "that such were the temptations and irreligious influences of a college life, that he considered it a *moral miracle*, that any youth who was not a decided Christian, should get through without moral contamination." Apart from the Sabbath exercises and "morning prayers," which are rather considered seasons for "muster," than seasons for prayer, what else can be found in our academies and colleges, of a religious nature, which constitutes a part of the prescribed course of *required* study or instruction? A very popular author, a clergyman, and formerly a professor in a New-England college, in a book written expressly for advice and counsel to teachers, in a chapter devoted to the discussion of "Religious Influence" in schools, says, "teachers are employed only for a partial and specific purpose," and that "they have no *right* to wander from that purpose;" which is "to teach *reading*, *writing*, *calculation*, and such other things *analogous* to these, as the law providing for schools contemplated;" and that "moral and religious instruction in a school is, in a great degree, *extra*-official in its nature."* Such, I suppose, is the opinion of professors in our schools and colleges generally; and this puts these institutions upon precisely the same ground, in respect to their religious character, as the common schools. It is this destitution of religious instruction and influence in our colleges, that makes them such places of fearful temptation and danger to the young. So well is their character for irreligious influence established, that it is proverbial to speak of the hazards of sending sons at an early age to their halls. And hence the melancholy fate of many a youth, who having left the parental roof, with a fair fame and bright hopes—the child of promise, and of many prayers, fell an early blight to the contaminating influence of college life.

To ascertain, as far as possible, the amount of religious instruction in our academies and colleges, or the regard ever *professed* for this branch of education, I have been at some pains to examine the programme of studies and text-books in their published course, with reference to this point; and the result is, that of about *one hundred private schools* and *academies* of high character, and *twenty-two* of our most flourishing *colleges*, thus examined, only *three* of the former, and *two* of the latter, have *any reference* whatever in their "course of study," to the *religious* nature of man! So that, as in the common schools, whatever of religious influence is exercised and felt in them, is not the result of a special provision for that end, but is accidental—"*altogether foreign* to their DESIGN."

Such, then, is the condition of our system of popular education, from the primary school to the university; *destitute* as a controlling influence, of the conservative power of the Christian religion. And this I call a system of *infidelity* or *heathenism*; for the absence of light, both in the natural and moral world is *darkness*. Religion is not of spontaneous growth in the human heart; and unless by diligent and unremitting culture, the soil is preoccupied by the "plants of righteousness," thorns and briars will take root and grow with a rank luxuriance. So that this whole system of popular instruction is a system of practical infidelity—baneful in its tendency, will as certainly, as far as its influence goes, shut out all the *grounds* of moral responsibility, and turn upon the land a wicked, unbelieving, and ungodly generation, who will, unless God should, in some other way interpose, run wild in licentiousness, and riot in unmitigated sin, as did the guilty men of Sodom, who could not hold up between themselves and Heaven's wrath the preservative influence of ten righteous men. I know that our system of popular education, is the emphatic "*boast*" of our country; and the pulpit, the press, and every organ of public address, is forever congratulating us upon *this* "glorious result of our free institutions." But such boasts are vain, and show a great deal of ignorance, both of its nature and extent.

The effects of this system of instruction upon the social and political interests of the country, will be matter for future remark; I am concerned just now, only to show that as a system of education, it is a system anti-Christian, or *infidel*, in its character.

It has been shown that *it is destitute of religion*, as one of its elements. Does this make it, what I have declared it to be—*a system of infidelity?* It appears so to my mind. Does it to the minds of those whose opinions upon the subject are entitled to as much weight as human authority can give? Let us see. It is well known that *Lancaster's* plan of educating all the children of a nation was to exclude all the specific forms of religion, and instruct them either not at all on that subject, or only on

* "Even the reading of the scriptures in schools, your petitioners cannot regard otherwise than as sectarian."—Petition of the Catholics to the Board of Aldermen of New-York, Sept. 1840.

† I have been informed, by one of the school directors, that the Quakers in the city of Philadelphia, presented objections to the "singing" in the infant schools, and to audible prayer in others. The singing was accordingly stopped. The Catholics also objected to the Bible.

* "*The Teacher*," by *Jacob Abbot*, p. 160, et passim.

such general points as all agreed in. On which *Coleridge* remarks: "I do not hesitate to declare that considering this as a plan of poisoning the children of the poor with a sort of *potential infidelity* under the *liberal idea* of teaching those points only of religious faith, in which all denominations agree, I cannot but denounce the so called Lancastrian Schools as pernicious beyond all power of compensation by the new acquirement of reading and writing."*

At the annual meeting of the Exeter Diocesan Board of Education, the Bishop of Exeter related the following anecdote of that distinguished man, the Duke of Wellington—whose wisdom in council equals his valor in war. "After the Duke's return from India, when the whole country was mad about Lancaster's system of education, at the dinner table of a friend much conversation took place on this subject. The Duke listened to the arguments pro and con, and then emphatically addressed the company as follows: "*Take care what you are about, for unless the education you give is based upon religion, you are only making as many more clever devils.*"

In a pamphlet published by the venerable Dr. Rush in 1791, he thus expresses his opinion upon this subject. "The present fashionable practice of rejecting the BIBLE from our schools, I suspect was originated by the *deists. They discover great ingenuity in this new mode of attacking Christianity. If they proceed in it, they will do more in half a century, in extirpating our religion, than Bolingbroke or Voltaire could have effected in a thousand years.*" They *have* succeeded, and the prophecy is now in course of rapid fulfilment. This tremendous evil has come upon the community with such an insidious and imperceptible advance, that it has attracted but little notice, and has even succeeded in entwining itself about the hearts of the best men in the land. Let but this same momentous evil present itself in some *new form*, and its hideousness will be apparent to all, and the good man and the patriot would unite in its emphatic condemnation. Familiarity with the present mode of its exhibition has blinded the perception and weakened the sensibility of the community to its true character. The religious community, from one end of the land to the other, have manifested no little alarm at that condition in the will of the late Stephen Girard, which requires, in the administration of the College, the exclusion of *clergyman* from its offices. It has been denounced as an "*infidel*" College, and likely to prove a curse rather than a blessing to society. And I have understood that the late venerable Bishop White expressed the opinion that Christian men ought not to accept such a trust on such a condition The following is the provision in the will alluded to: "Secondly, I enjoin and require that no ecclesiastic, missionary or minister of any sect whatsoever, shall ever hold or exercise any station or duty in the said College. . . . . In making this distinction I do not mean to cast any reflection upon any sect or person whatsoever; but as there is such a multitude of sects, and such a diversity of opinions amongst them, I desire to keep the tender minds of the orphans who are to derive advantage from this bequest, free from the excitement which clashing doctrines and sectarian controversy are so likely to produce. My desire is, that all the instructors and teachers in the College shall take pains to instil into the minds of the scholars the purest principles of morality, so that on their entrance into active life, they may, from inclination and habit, evince benevolence toward their fellow creatures, and a love of truth, sobriety and industry; adopting at the same time such religious tenets as their matured reason may enable them to prefer."

On this provision I believe there has been but one sentiment among the religious community throughout the land; and the following extract from a paragraph which appeared the last week in two of the religious papers in Philadelphia, expresses the views generally entertained by Christian people of the character of the Girard College: "*It was founded in unrighteousness.* The testator endeavored studiously to exclude from it all religious instruction, and forbid the minister of God from ever passing its threshold. . . . Can the blessing of God rest upon such an *infidel* establishment? We judge not. . . . Had Mr. Girard buried his school fund in the deep, the cause of education in Pennsylvania would have suffered no loss."

But Girard College stands not alone in her "infidel" position. If it be more boldly defined, —which I rather doubt—it is not more actually divorced from religion than hundreds among us, on which we lavish our encomiums and bestow our patronage; nay more—I aver that our whole common school system is more thoroughly infidel and anti-christian than the provision in Mr. Girard's will above quoted, can make his College. And this shall not be mere assertion. I have given, in a previous number, evidence of the utter exclusion of religion from our common school system,—have shown that it is declared by the public authorities in those matters, that "*if religion is taught at all in the schools, it is foreign to their design, and ought immediately to be abandoned.*" And the parallel between the provision for education made by Mr. Girard, who is supposed to have been an infidel, and to have intended to found an infidel college, and whose provision for this purpose is universally regarded as an infidel scheme—the parallel between this and the New-York school system, which I take as a fair representative of the whole American system, is worthy of most particular notice. And I would ask particular attention to it. In the first place, Mr. Girard excludes *clergymen* from his College. And is there a similar proscription of these dangerous men in the common school system? "*In this state,*" (New-York,) says the Rev. Dr. Knox in the debate on the Roman Catholic petition before the Common Council, 28th of October last—"*there is not a minister of religion that can ever be appointed as the Superintendent of a Common School.*"* And in the Report of the Committee on the petition, we are told that "the public school Society" of the city, "admits to membership any citizen of good moral character, *who is not a clergyman.*"† And I have understood, that upon application being made for a vacant office in an Institution, not a thousand miles from Girard College, and which is supported like the common schools, and a part of the same system, it was deemed a satisfactory objection that the applicant was a *clergyman.*

In the second place, compare the *reasons* assigned for this exclusion. Mr. Girard says he is induced to adopt this course from his dread of the evils that are likely to ensue from "the multitude of sects, and diversity of opinion," clashing doctrines, and sectarian controversy, &c. Now, it is precisely on this ground, that the necessity for expelling religion from our Common Schools is predicated. Says Mr. Ketchum, before the Common Council, in giving the reasons why religion *must* be excluded: "We are divided into different sects, and if we were taxed for the support of religion," (in the schools) "it would happen that a man would be taxed for the support of a religion which he did not believe; and men would sooner march to the stake than do it." And the report of the committee of Assistant Aldermen to whom petitions upon this subject were referred last spring, argue the impossibility of granting them on the ground of the "multitude of sects;" and Mr. Girard, I think, could never have felt a greater horror at the anticipated results of having that "apple of discord" thrown in among his innocent orphans, than this committee express in view of results that would follow the granting of a petition for aid in establishing schools where religion should be taught, they say: "religious zeal degenerating into fanatacism and bigotry, has covered many battle-fields with its victims; the stake, the gibbet, and the prison, have fallen to the lot of countless martyrs; exile from the land of their nativity, expulsion to the wilderness have been experienced by hundreds of almost every sect," &c.—all which is so much reason for expelling religion from the schools.

In the third place, Mr. Girard enjoins, that the teachers "instil the *purest principles of morality*" into the minds of the pupils. And in the report of the Common Council, presented January 11, they say: "*though religon constitutes no specific part of the system of instruction, yet they do teach moral sentiments, which do not conflict with sectarian views and peculiarities.*" p. 561. Here the parallel ceases, and a *contrast* is presented, by no means favorable to the position of the Common School system. We have seen that *religion*, soul, body, spirit and form, is expelled from the Common Schools, while the Girard College only expels its *ministers*; Mr. Girard enjoins that the "*purest principles of morality* shall be instilled into the minds of the orphans;" and, infidels themselves being judges, the purest code of morals is the *Bible;* the Bible, therefore, whether so intended by the testator or not, must be a *text book* in the Institution. Girard College, from its infidel character, has received without stint, the denunciations and rebukes of the pulpit and the press; and will they now be silent over this stupendous scheme, that, within its ample embrace, includes about *nineteen-twentieths* of all in the land who are receiving the elements of an education?

C. D. J.

* Statesman's Manual, page 54.

* Debate as p. 37.
† Report of Special Com. p. 559

Ecclesiastical Intelligence.

MASSACHUSETTS.

We are happy to learn that Bishop Griswold, on Sunday last, (14th inst.) was able to hold a confirmation in Grace Church. The bishop made an impressive address to the candidates, and administered the solemn rite to twenty-five persons.—*Ch. Witness.*

NEW-YORK.

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S APPOINTMENTS FOR THE ANNUAL CONFIRMATIONS IN NEW-YORK AND BROOKLYN.

First Sunday in Lent, February 28, St. Paul's Chapel.
Third Sunday in Lent, March 14, St. John's Chapel.
Fifth Sunday in Lent, March 28, St. Bartholomew's Church.
Sunday next before Easter, April 4, St. Mark's Church.
Second Sunday after Easter, and Festival of St. Mark the Evangelist, April 25, St. Ann's Church, *Brooklyn Churchman.*

Bishop Onderdonk requests that those Deacons

of this Diocese who expect to apply for Priest's Orders during the ensuing season, will give him immediate notice.

He also requests that he may be informed what consecrations of churches will be expected, and of the times severally, at which it is supposed, they will be ready.—*Ibid.*

EPISCOPAL ACTS BY THE BISHOP OF THIS DIOCESE.

City of New York.—Sexagesima Sunday, February 14, in St. Andrew's Church, admitted the minister of the parish, the Rev. James R. Bayley, Deacon, to Priests' Orders. Morning Prayer was read by the Rev. William Morris, Rector of Trinity School, (who also presented the candidate,) assisted by the Rev. Lawson Carter, of Brooklyn, who read the Lessons; and the Sermon preached by the Bishop.

In the afternoon, confirmed 29 in the Chapel of the Church of the Nativity.

The Rev. Cyrus Stebbins, D. D., died at Waterford on the morning of the 8th inst. Of his age and the circumstances of his death we are not informed. We shall hope soon to have a fuller notice of this venerable servant of the altar, who though some years our senior, received Holy Orders at our side.—*Gospel Messenger.*

Professor Turner of the Theological Seminary, New York, has in press a critical commentary on Genesis. Prof. Bush will issue his commentary on Exodus sometime in March.—*Ib.*

WESTERN NEW-YORK.

On Sunday, January 31st., Bishop De Lancey visited St. John's Church, Sodus, where he preached both A. M. and P. M., confirming in the afternoon *six* persons. In the evening he preached in the school-house at Sodus Point. Prayers were read on each occasion by the Rev. Erastus Spalding, of Vienna.

On Monday evening, Feb. 1st, the Bishop preached at the flourishing village of Newark, in the same county, in the Presbyterian Church, at, which a large audience, notwithstanding a storm attended. Prayers were read by the Rev. Mr. Cook, of Lyons. The Rev. Mr. Spalding also was present.

The Bishop visited St. Paul's Church, Waterloo, on Sunday, Feb. 7th, and preached twice to very large congregations. In the afternoon *thirteen* persons were confirmed. The prayers were read by the Rev. Mr. Acly, of Seneca Falls, and the preface in the communion office by the Rev. Mr. Wheeler, the minister of the parish.—*Gospel Messenger.*

NEW-JERSEY.

We have received from Mr. Dusenbury, the proprietor of St. Matthews' Hall, at Port Colden, a copy of his proposition to invest, upon certain terms, the property in Trustees, for the promotion of "the good work of Christian education in the Church;" and an exceedingly good work it is. Mr. Dusenbury deserves the thanks and good wishes of the Church for his zeal, and we heartily wish him success. He proposes to divide the value of the property in shares among the proprietors. The whole number of shares to be 180 at $100 each, and he will take one third of the whole himself. The Right Rev. Bishop Doane, George M. Wharton, Esq., of Philadelphia, and Charles King, Esq., of New York, are proposed as the Trustees to whom the property is to be conveyed, should the stock be taken. The terms proposed by Mr. Dusenbury are very liberal, and we recommend his pamphlet to the consideration and benevolence of those of our communion who have been favored by Heaven with the means of doing good.

PENNSYLVANIA.

A confirmation was held on Sunday morning, February 14th, in Gloria Dei (Swedes) Church, Southwark, where Bishop Onderdonk confirmed thirteen persons. On the afternoon of the same day, in St. Thomas' Church, Philadelphia, eleven persons were confirmed.

OHIO.

KENYON COLLEGE—THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

In a former number, we took occasion, from a very intimate knowledge of the actual state of our Diocesan Institutions at Gambier, to say, in general terms, that they are in a flourishing state. At the time we were not aware that a different opinion had to any extent obtained—otherwise, it might have seemed proper to go a little more into detail, than at that time we felt called upon to do. In our last, we gave our readers an abstract of the catalogue of students just published, imagining that we should again advert to the subject. We take occasion now to invite attention to the college and seminary.

Kenyon College we regard as unequivocally the most deserving of the rank of a College, of any institution *known to us* at the West. It is *bona fide* a College of a decidedly high character. We well remember to have heard from the lips of one of the most intelligent and successful educators of the west, an expression in reference to Kenyon College, still stronger than that we have used, and we have never heard a scholar of liberal mind intimately acquainted with the *regime* of Kenyon, and its faithful and thorough course of study, who did not feel obliged to award to it this praise at least; that it is one of the ripest and best institutions of our Western states—and steadily, year by year, earning rank among the most stable and thorough educational establishments of the country. Its growth has been slow—it has been strengthened by trial, and is now, in the most unequivocal and best sense, worthy the confidence and the prayers and the benefactions of all who honor sound learning, in candidly avowed connexion with the piety and discipline of the Episcopal church.

Differences of opinion there may at times have been, as to the wisdom of certain measures during the eleven or twelve years of its history of constantly growing usefulness—but how unworthy the least enlarged mind—especially how unworthy of any Christian among us, who desires to see our Zion at the West arise and shine, to allow any such honest differences of opinion for one moment to have influence in lessening his interest and zeal for the college. Above all, how unworthy of true candour, any prejudice which should blind the eye to the present interesting state and prospects of the Institution.

The Faculty are men of acknowledged ability and worth—practical and experienced educators, harmonious and enthusiastic in their work; the library is one of the best, if not decidedly the very best of any institution west of the mountains, and the locality singularly favorable for the pursuit of study—in a word, Kenyon College, instead of the mere pretensions of an academy or high school for boys, is in the fullest sense what is meant by a College, not in name, but in fact—having also its subordinate and preparatory schools for pupils, either preparing for a collegiate course or for business.

Kenyon College stands in no need of commendation from us. Its Alumni, many of them already occupying stations of commanding influence and usefulness are its living epistles. Its present able and zealous faculty, its noble *corps* of students, the stronghold it has upon the confidence and respect of the most enlarged minds of the west, and of the whole country; these are a sufficient guaranty that no gratuitous ill report of its being less flourishing than heretofore, will do it the slightest permanent injury. We should rejoice, however, to see every Episcopalian of the west, at least, understanding and appreciating it rightly: and it is for this reason that we have felt called upon to speak what we do know.—*W. Epis. Ob.*

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE DIOCESE OF OHIO.

A report has circulated to some extent, without the slightest foundation in truth, and it is perhaps just to presume without the slightest *intention* on the part of any one, of injury to the institutions at Gambier, that the Theological Department—or to speak with accuracy—the Theological Seminary, is almost or quite extinct; and that the only Theological Seminaries now worthy to be regarded as such, are those of New-York and Alexandria! We cannot but express our unfeigned astonishment at such a report, while the students of the Seminary have never been less than *nine* (in the most depressed state of the funds of the Education and Missionary Society on which they chiefly depend for support) and while the corps of Theological Professors including the Bishop of the Diocese, who is zealously engaged in the duties of the Seminary half the year, has never for the last three years, been less than *four*, and for the greater part of that time, not less than *five*, and while arrangements have been steadily, and according to means in hand, in progress, for the completion of Bexley Hall for the accomodation of a greater number of students. We deem it a sacred duty to the Church (to the discharge of which we are prompted, as well by our love to the Seminary, as by a conviction that its actual state of present usefulness and its promise of yearly increasing usefulness are such, as to entitle it to the fullest confidence of every western churchman) to vindicate it on every fitting occasion from such misrepresentation.

What would the church in Ohio have been—not to speak of other Western Dioceses—but for the Theological Seminary of Ohio? Are we aware that of the fifty-five clergymen of Ohio, nearly one half of this number have been either partially or fully educated at the Theological Seminary at Gambier? Are we aware that this Seminary is really the best hope of the church in Ohio?—The things that remain are *not* ready to die. *They are strong*—but need still to be strengthened, by our prayers, by our liberal pecuniary aid, by our generous confidence, and hearty and harmonious support. The Seminaries of the east are doing a noble work for the East, and to a very limited extent, for the west. But it is utterly idle to think of their meeting the demands of the West—and as ungenerous and narrow as it is idle, to claim for them superiority in any thing material, over the Theological Seminary of Ohio. We rejoice in their prosperity, and give God thanks for the good they have done, and are doing; but we are jealous for the honor of the Seminary at Gambier, which we fully believe to be destined to accomplish a work for the Churc

in the West, far greater and more important than it is possible for our Eastern Seminaries to accomplish.

Let our Ohio Seminary therefore, till others at the West shall be in full operation, have our undivided and cordial support. Let the worthy professors who are bearing the burden and heat of the day, have the encouragement of our prayers, and of our fullest confidence. Let it be seen and let them be called upon to see, what they ought to make the Seminary committed to their administration, and if there be any thing lacking, let their learning and zeal, and the wisdom and zeal and liberality of the Church supply it.—*Western Episcopal Observer.*

MICHIGAN.

Episcopal Acts.—Dec. 9th, Bishop McCoskry confirmed *four* persons in St. Paul's Church, Detroit. Jan. 12th, at a visitation of the Church at Clinton (Rev. Mr. Stout's,) the Bishop confirmed *four* persons.—*West. Ep. Observer.*

It affords us the sincerest pleasure to learn that the congregation of St. Paul's, Detroit, under the immediate pastoral care of the Bishop, has so far increased as to require enlargement of the Church edifice. This we trust will soon be effected.—*Ib.*

ROMAN CATHOLIC MISSIONS.

We presume that few of our readers have an adequate idea of the immense efforts made by the Roman Catholics to secure the empire of the world. We shall, therefore, make a long extract from one of their own publications on the subject. The work from which we quote is the *Annals for the Propagation of the Faith,* (*Annales de la Propagation de la Foi,*) published every two months at Rome. It is published in seven different languages, and is said to circulate near a hundred thousand copies. The article in question was translated for the *Missionary Herald.*

The whole strength of the Romish Church, as there stated, is,—

Bishops, - - - - - -	800
Members, - - -	152,000,000.

Of these the following belong to the missions.

	Bish.	*Coadj.*	*Priests.*	*Cath.*
Europe,	20		579	387,00
Asia,	69	10	2,856	2,211,000
Africa,	5		97	188,000
America,	24	5	629	1,751,000?
Oceanica,	3		59	45,500
	121	15	4,220	4,582,500.

ROMAN CATHOLIC MISSIONS IN AMERICA.

After a detail of some of the history of North America, the article goes on to say :—

"At a late hour, heresy made her appearance, and led to the coasts of North America, the most violent of her disciples, the restless Puritans. Soon, other sects cast their scum upon the same shores, and Protestantism gained sovereignty in the thirteen colonies, which were destined to become the United States. The new republic soon acquired Louisiana and the Floridas, while the cession of Canada to England gave to the pretended reformation a second empire in the North. Yet the Catholic Church could not abandon the invaded territory. Despoiled of her honors, deprived of all resources but those of grace, all power but that of the word, *she has never ceased to maintain the struggle so vigorously, that her adversaries begin to doubt the issue.* ☞ *Whether half the new world shall be the domain of truth or of error, is a question yet to be decided.*"

We have marked the last clause in italics, and inserted a hand, to call the attention of our readers to the *designs* of the Romanists. The plain English of this passage is, *whether half of America shall be Protestant or Romanist, is a question yet to be decided.* We shall mark some other passages with italics.

"The missions in America may be divided into two principal groups—those in the United States, and those in the English possessions; to which may be added, the Dutch colonies, and the republic of Texas.

1. *United States.*—It will suffice briefly to mention some general facts, which have been copiously detailed in the 'Annals;' such as the increase of the three millions who inhabited the country at the declaration of independence to thirteen millions: the emigrations from England, Ireland, and Germany, by which alone this prodigious increase can be explained; the impossibility which the Catholic religion encountered at first, of meeting the new wants with its small number of ministers, and destitution of pecuniary means; the multitude of colonists without pastors, orphans without asylum, and children without schools, who became an easy prey to the opulent proselytism of the Protestant sects; and, finally, the happy efforts which have triumphed over such dangers. An archbishop and fifteen bishops have collected around them a clergy of 500 members, and a Catholic population of about 1,250,000 souls. There have risen, already, under the auspices of the prelates, 11 seminaries, 16 colleges, 45 boarding schools, 42 charity schools, 25 asylums, containing more than 1000 orphans, 7 hospitals, 14 institutions for the relief of various classes of the unfortunate. Having thus made all things ready, religion waits at the ports to receive the European emigrants whom poverty annually leads there, to the number of two or three hundred thousand. She addresses each in his own language; she introduces them to friends of their own nation; she takes their children in her arms; she shares their sufferings, which are often the heaviest part of their scanty baggage. She readily condescends to the necessities of time and place; *she uses advantageously the freedom of the press and parliamentary forms; and seven journals are devoted to her defence, and solemn discussions, surrounded by all desirable guaranties of publicity, snatch numerous victims from error.* While all the artificial wants of the most advanced civilization are thus met, apostolic men are collecting the fragments of savage tribes, crowded together, transplanted to the extremities of the union; while in the cities and on the surrounding plantations, the poor negroes also receive the consolations of the faith, which reveals to them the pardon of their sins. In view of such beneficial results, we may well believe that the creation of the American episcopate will rank as one of the most important events in the ecclesiastical history of the nineteenth century. Its efficacious activity recalls to mind something of those labors of organization, by which the illustrious Bishops of primitive times, among the depraved Romans, the Arians and the barbarians, provided for the future welfare of modern nations. *In ten years, the number of Dioceses has increased one-fourth; and that of priests and of faithful, one-third. Their union secures for them an infallible preponderance, in the midst of the perpetual divisions of heretical opinions. In the Atlantic states, they form a powerful minority. In the greater part of the western states, they form a plurality, and at some points, perhaps a majority of the inhabitants.* But great sacrifices are demanded, to confirm and extend these admirable results. It would be bad economy to delay the establishment of Christian institutions where the land belongs, so to speak, to the first occupant. Finally religion should be able to say, like its Divine Author, to the emigrant families, who are going every day to build new hamlets, villages and cities, "Verily, wherever you assemble in my name, there I will be in the midst of you."

A few lines and figures may suffice to explain the particular condition of the different dioceses, the general character of which has been given.

1. *Archbishopric of Baltimore*, (State of Maryland, district of Columbia.)—One Archbishop, 68 priests, 2 seminaries, one of which belongs to Messrs. the Sulpicians, 40 seminaries 1 noviciate of the Company of Jesus, 5 female convents, 63 churches or chapels, 10 other stations, 3 asylums, containing nearly 120 children, 7 free schools, 2 colleges, 9 boarding-schools, 2 hospitals, 9 charitable societies.

2. *Bishopric of Richmond*, (State of Virginia.)—The administration is intrusted to the Archbishop of Baltimore. It has 6 priests, 7 churches or chapels, 12 other stations; 2 boarding-schools, 1 asylum with 8 orphans, 1 hospital, 1 charitable society.

3. *Bishopric of Philadelphia*, (States of Pennsylvania and Delaware and part of New-Jersey.)—One Bishop, 1 coadjutor, 49 priests, 1 seminary with 12 pupils; 78 churches or chapels; 1 college, 2 boarding-schools, 4 asylums with nearly 140 children, 2 schools.

Bishopric of New-York, (States of New-York and New-Jersey.—1 Bishop, 1 coadjutor, 63 priests, 1 seminary and 9 seminarists; 54 churches, 44 stations, 1 college, 2 boarding-schools, 8 schools one of which is for Germans, 5 asylums, in which are collected more than 300 orphans.

5. *Bishopric of Boston*, States of Maine, New-Hampshire, Rhode Island and Connecticut.*)—1 Bishop, 28 priests; 1 female convent; 30 churches 15 stations, 1 college, 1 boarding-school, 1 free school.

6. *Bishopric of Detroit*, (State of Michigan, Territory of Wisconsin,)—One Bishop, 19 priests; 16 churches and 14 stations; 1 college, 3 schools for Germans, English, and French, 5 for the savages.

7. *Bishopric of Cincinnati*, (State of Ohio.)—One Bishop, 35 priests, 1 seminary, and 15 students, 1 convent of the reverend fathers, the Dominicians; 1 female convent; 24 churches, 16 stations; 1 boarding-school 1 asylum which has collected 30 orphans, 1 German school.

8. *Bishopric of Vincennes*, (State of Indiana, and part of Illinois.)—One Bishop, 25 priests, 1 seminary, managed by Messrs. the Eudists; 20 seminarists; 27 churches, and 30 stations; 1 college, 1 boarding-school, 2 schools. This fine diocese has existed but six years.

9. *Bishopric of Dubuque*, (Territory of Iowa,) erected in 1837.—One Bishop, 7 priests, 4 seminarists, 3 churches and 4 stations, 1 college, and 1 school just commenced.

10. *Bishopric of St. Louis*, (State of Missouri, part of Illinois, State of Arkansas, Territory of Missouri.)—One Bishop, 73 priests, 1 seminary under the direction of Messrs. the Lazarists, 27 pupils, 1 noviciate of the Company of Jesus; 11

* Massachusetts seems to have been omitted through ignorance or mistake.—*Tr.*

female convents; 53 churches, 60 stations; 3 colleges, 11 boarding-schools, 6 schools, 5 asylums, with more than 100 orphans, 1 hospital, two charitable societies. The reverend fathers, the Belgian Jesuits, five in number, are evangelizing the savage tribes collected by the American government upon the territory of Missouri. The greatest number of neophytes are among the Pottowattamies, the Kickapoos, the Kanzas, the Peorias, and the Weas. The renunciations of protestantism amount to about 200 a year.

11. *Bishopric of Bardstown*, (State of Kentucky.) One Bishop, 2 coadjutors, 45 priests, 1 seminary recently founded, under the direction of the reverend fathers the Jesuits, 1 convent of the reverend fathers the Dominicans; 3 female convents; 40 churches and 70 other stations; 3 colleges, 10 boarding-schools, 1 institution for the education of deaf mutes, 1 German school, 1 asylum with 42 orphans.

12. *Bishopric of Nashville*, (State of Tennessee,) erected in 1837. One Bishop and 3 priests of the order of St. Dominick, 1 church and 10 stations.

13. *Bishopric of New-Orleans*, (State of Louisiana.) One bishop, 49 priests, 1 seminary, under the direction of Messrs. the Lazarists, 12 seminarists; 4 female convents; 36 churches or chapels, 1 college, 4 boarding schools, 1 school, 3 asylums with 162 orphans, 1 hospital.

14. *Bishopric of Natchez*, (State of Mississippi.) This Diocese has not yet received its organization, It was erected in 1837, but as the ecclesiastics who have been nominated to the Bishopric have declined, it remains vacant. It has only one priest and one church.

15. *Bishopric of Mobile*, (State of Alabama, Territory of the Floridas) One bishop, 13 priests; 1 female convent; 7 churches, 23 stations; 1 college, 2 boarding schools, 1 asylum, 3 schools.

16. *Bishopric of Charlestown*,* (States of North and South Carolina and Georgia.) One bishop, 19 priests; 2 female convents; 14 churches, and 53 stations; 2 boarding schools, and 1 asylum, 1 retreat for invalid priests, 1 hospital for mechanics, [ouvriers, laborers,] 2 charitable societies.†—*Protestant Christian and Church Chronicle.*

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

Literary.

[*For the Church Record.*]

OLD LITERATURE.

HISTORY OF THE ESSAY.—SIR WM. TEMPLE.

AN Essay explains itself. It needs no definition. Its aim is apparent. In the first instance, it meant no more than a bare attempt at throwing together a few rude hints or individual suggestions. Such was its first form. Afterward it began to assume a higher tone, a position of authority. It became from suggestive, didactic. It taught as well as gossiped and was framed as well for instruction, as for amusement. It was at one time a homily, at another a satire; now picturesque and descriptive, then grave and analytical. At present it is a compound of the easy and familiar with the dignified and impressive. In different hands it is a very different thing—with one, it is a subtle criticism or comic satire; with another it is a stately argument or deep morality. One writer makes it the vehicle of swelling political sentiment: another, (and, perhaps, a sounder thinker) conveys individual impressions and draws on his personal experience. More than any other form of composition, it has been made the mirror of individual character—it allows of egotism, of confessions. It is in a word, a species of critical autobiography. From the essays of Montaigne, of Cowley, of Temple, of Steele, of Hazlitt, Hunt and Lamb, we glean the real character of their authors. They serve not only instead of, but supply better than most biographers could, the true traits of those fine thinkers, and their characteristic tempers.

In this view, the Essay may be regarded as a sort of prose lyric—for the origin of that form of poetry, was an irrepressible passion for uttering the secret impulses and master sentiments of the soul.

The ancient writers have left no works answering to our modern idea of the Essay. The moral discourses of Plato, and Seneca, the ravishing dissertations of Plutarch, and the sentences of Epictetus, are in another vein. Their rhetorical and etherial treatises were formal text books, such as Aristotle's Poetics, the institutes of Quinctilian, and Cicero de Officiis.

Montaigne, in France, is commonly considered the father of the modern Essay: though we Americans and the English, look to the profound pages of Lord Bacon, as *our* original. The Essay of Montaigne is a composition quite unlike the latter Essay. It was rather (in his familiar style,) a personal journal of his feeling and fancies; for, of all writers Montaigne is the most whimsical; in his serious vein, it was a servile copy of Plutarch and Seneca, stiff, dry and starched, with stoical precision. It was dogmatic and assuming. But in his mixed style, of familiar, shrewd observation, deep feeling, quaint egotism and mosaic pedantry, he is the first of the early essayists. To a precise, clear thinker of the present day, Montaigne is insufferably circuitous. His mind seemed to look all *round* a subject, instead of directly *at* it. Still, he was an independent thinker, (always high praise; but in his own day a peculiar distinction.) He is full of curious whims, a rich humorist.

After Montaigne, France had no purely essay writer of much merit. She had admirable writers, somewhat in that way, but they were sententiously and almost entirely in the form of maxims and reflections as Labruyere, Nicole, Rochefoucault.

Passing over to England, (for Spain has no universal essayist, and Italy has a minor writer on etiquette, Count Castiglione,) we come at once to the pride of his age, the master-thinker of all times—Lord Bacon: the incessant eulogies on our first essayist, have made the merits of his admirable proverbs, (for his essays read like Ecclesiastes,) universally known. For sense and practical wisdom, joined to fine fancy, that colors the tritest theme, Bacon has never been surpassed. But neither was he our essayist in our modern acceptation—he was more, a great philosopher, condescending to write short moral papers.

Sir W. Temple was our first classic in this department. He is commonly placed at the head of the *genteel* class of writers; my Lord Shaftesbury being generally considered his rival. From this criticism we would venture to dissent, and shall give our reasons at length in a becoming place.

Charles Lamb, in a short paper, has pointed out the aristocratic air which pervades all his writings. Sir William was a diplomat and a Counsellor of State, for the greater part of his life, and hence, contracted an official style of composition. There is a fine tone of courtly breeding in our favorite essayist; such, as in his consolotary letter to the Countess of Essex, and in his love of rehearsing the full titles of all his correspondents and noble acquaintance.

Sir William was a scholar of the old school and a martyr to the gout. He has written with great gusto, both on the gout (in a letter to Monsieur de Zulichem,) and on poetry. He imagined he had made a discovery with regard to curing the first, and took the side of the Ancients, in the famous controversy between the Ancients and Moderns, in the last. It is difficult to extract from Temple, since his style is so continuous and flowing, that several pages are needed, to give a fair sample of his manner of treating a single topic, A few concluding sentences may be picked out of his Essay on Poetry. "I know very well that many who pretend to be wise, by the forms of being grave, are apt to despise both poetry, and music as toys and trifles too light for the use or entertainment of serious men. But, whoever find themselves wholly insensible to their charms, would do well to keep their own council, for fear of reproaching their own temper, and bringing the goodness of their natures, if not of their understandings, into question; it may be thought at least an ill sign if, not an ill constitution, since some of the Fathers went so far as to esteem the love of music a sign of predestination, as a thing divine, and reserved for the felicities of heaven itself. While this world lasts, I doubt not, but the pleasure and request of these two entertainments will do so too, and happy those that can content themselves with them, or any other so easy and so innocent, and do not trouble the world or other men, because they cannot be quiet themselves, though no body hurts them. When all is done, human life, is at the greatest and best, but like a froward child, that must be played with and humored as such, to keep it quiet, till it falls asleep, and then the care is over."

A rich strain this of natural eloquence, which it would be pedantry to call Ciceronian and untrue, for we conceive it to have all the stateliness, without a particle of the affectation of the Roman. The last sentence smacks strongly of materialism, which inclines one to agree with those who looked on Sir William as a skeptic in matters of religion.

The letter to the Countess of Essex, is the letter of a refined gentleman, who is also, (as few gentlemen can pretend to be,) a charming writer. In this latter capacity, Temple is a sort of prose Spencer. His cadences (like that most musical of Poets,) rise and fall as the waves of the sea: and, he has a continuous melody, as if he wrote to the soft strains of music. His turns and transitions are as graceful, as his love and faith must have been; and the generous, romantic, whimsical scholar and statesman was but the converse, of that other character of fine writer, which together made up the man, Sir Wm. Temple.

The next paper will be occupied with a consideration of Cowley and his essays. J.

Topics of the Times.

OUR RELATIONS WITH ENGLAND.

We have dared to express frankly the opinion that the difficulties now existing and palpably augmenting between this country and Great Britain can only be adjusted, and a horribly sanguinary and destructive war avoided, by the existence and manifestation of a spirit of peace, of conciliation and of compromise on both sides. We have always maintained that the right of this country to *three-fourths* of the territory on the North-eastern boundary, now in dispute between the two nations,

* So in the original, by mistake for Charleston.—*Tr.*

† These details, which are rigorously exact, are borrowed from the Metropolitan Catholic Almanac, for 1840' published undor the patronage of the Bishops.

is clearly with the United States, and must be acknowledged and established in any adjustment which may be made. At the same time we have felt constrained to admit that our claim to that small and (to us) totally worthless portion of the territory watered by the Ristigouche and other streams tending eastward into the Bay of Chaleur is *not* clear, and that there is strength in the British position that a line described as "running due North to the highlands which divide the rivers that empty themselves into the river St. Lawrence from those which fall into the Atlantic Ocean," could not have been intended to cross four or five rivers which run in neither of the directions indicated, but eastwardly into the Bay of Chaleur. What fair mind does not feel the force of this consideration ? We have therefore recommended and urged a generous and manly offer of compromise on our part, which shall take as its basis the award or opinion of the King of Holland, giving us all the Aroostook country, all the disputed territory South of the St. John and St. Francis Rivers — in short, *three-fourths* in extent, *nine-tenths* in positive value, and *ninety-nine hundredths* in relative value to us — if the residue be worth any thing at all — while at the same time we concede to Great Britain the frozen region which is necessary to her, to preserve her line of communication between the Canadas and her Atlantic colonies. Such is our suggestion — such "the very head and front of our offending." It is an offence of long standing, however.

With regard to the growing difficulties on our northern frontier, we have expressed the opinion that *our* people are most in the wrong, having begun the mischief by the "patriot" operations at Buffalo in 1837, by the seizure of State ordnance, the hostile occupation of Navy Island, and the general "sympathising" in men, munitions and provisions, with that absurd, flagitious movement. The British have also done wrong, especially in burning the Caroline ; but their conduct, if unjustifiable, was by no means unprovoked. He who asserts that the previous and subsequent operations on our side of the line were consistent with the relations of peace and the requirements of good neighborhood is besotted beyond the reach of argument. The contrary is plain as demonstration can make it.

We therefore insist that it is the duty of the two nations to bear and forbear — to pass lightly as possible over past irregularities on either side, and provide as soon as may be for the security and harmony of the future. We have not considered the proceedings at Lockport either reputable in themselves, calculated to promote the restoration of good feeling, or indeed to answer any purpose of good, and we have frankly said so. But our reprobatory comments have been restricted to the extra-judicial portion of those proceedings — to the processes under the authority of Judge Lynch, not of Judge Bowen.—*New Yorker.*

RELIGION IN FRANCE.

The absence of political power attached to any particular church in France, carries with it this good, that it procures a degree of tolerance distinct from indifference, which acts as a humanizing ingredient in the national character. Not that the French Roman Catholic clergy are tolerant ; far from it : not that the decided unbeliever is tolerant ; this is equally an impossibility : but that there is much less of social bickerings, domestic heartburnings, and local jealousies caused by differences of religious belief, than in most other nations of Europe As far as the French are indifferent to religion, it is a great misfortune and curse to them ; for it renders them indifferent to and incapable of morality, and it tends to their national degeneration ; but as far as they are tolerant it is a blessing, for it civilizes them as a people, soothes their political passions, and leads them to religious inquiry. One of the most distinguished members of the Protestant community in France—one of the most tolerant, one of the most amiable, and, at the same time, virtuous of her citizens, is M. Guizot. He is, at the same time, the most eloquent orator in the legislative body, and of more individual political weight than any other native of France. This eminent philosopher and historian had a rare merit of soon appreciating as it deserved, that revolution which he was unable to prevent, and the still rarer courage to denounce it in the Chamber of Deputies in its true character, as "a national catastrophe," the evil effects of which it was high time to remedy, while the good ones were turned to the best account. M. Guizot, who has long been looked up to as the leader of the Protestant party in France, is a great advocate for the political existence of the Roman Catholic church as a civilizing agent, as an element of order in the French body politic. In his essay on Catholicism, Protestantism, and Philosophy, he thus expressed a summary of his views :

"French society is suffering from moral maladies of very different natures. There are some who are tired and disgusted with uncertainty and disorder of mind : they have need of a port where no tempest can penetrate—of a light that never flickers, and of a hand that will never let them stumble. They demand from religion support for their weakness, rather than aliment for their activity. It is requisite that religion, while she elevates, should also sustain them, and, while touching their hearts, should also subjugate their intelligence ; it is necessary for them, that while she animates their internal life, she should, at the same time, and above all things, give them a profound sentiment of security. Catholicism is marvelously adapted to this turn of mind, so frequent of occurrence in our days. It possesses satisfaction for such desires, and remedies for such sufferings ; it is able at the same time to conquer and to please ; its anchors are strong, and its prospects full of attraction for the imagination. It excels in giving occupation to the soul, at the same time that it allows it to rest ; it is acceptable after a period of great fatigue, for, without leaving the soul to become cold or inactive, it eases it of much labor, and lightens for it the burden of responsibility." . . . "For other minds also diseased, and also estranged from religion, more of intellectual and personal activity is required. These also experience the want of returning to God and the faith ; but they have got a habit of examining all things for themselves, and of admitting only what they have acquired by their own labors. They are anxious to fly from incredulity ; but their liberty is at the same time dear to them, and their tendency towards religion is caused more by thirst than by lassitude. It is to souls such as these that Protestantism finds access, since, while it tells them of piety and faith, it allows and encourages them to make use of their reason and their liberty. It is accused of being cold ; but this is an error Protestantism, by making a constant appeal to free and personal inquiry, penetrates far into the soul, and readily becomes an indwelling faith, in which the activity of the intelligence keeps up the fervor of the heart, instead of extinguishing it. Catholicism and Protestantism should never lose sight of the condition of French society, since it is upon that they have got to act. It is not between Catholicism and Protestantism that the contest is now going on—the contest of ideas and mastery ; impiety and immorality, these are the enemies which one and the other are equally called on to contend with ; to reanimate religious life, this is the work to which they are called—a work of immensity, for the evil itself is immense. An examination ever so slight of the moral state of these masses of men, with the mind so fluctuating and the heart so void, who have so many desires and so few hopes, and who pass so rapidly from fever of the soul to torpidity, is enough to fill one with melancholy and alarm."—*Blackwood for Oct.*

TURKEY AND EGYPT.

If governments knew themselves what they meant, and seized the fit occasions to give effect to their meaning, politics would not be the chaos of absurdities and contradictions which they are.

An empire which, some hundred years ago, was great, alarming, invading, conquering, has, in the course of irresistible events, been tottering to pieces. The Turkish power, which was long the terror of the Christian world, has, under the weight of its own corruptions and oppressions, been gradually sinking into helplessness. Some provinces have been wrested by ambitious neighbors, others have fallen into uncontrolled anarc;hy some have become mere deserts by depopulation, and decay; some have been emancipated from the Osmanli intruders by the more vigorous hands of their native races; while others have been separated by negotiations and protocols, though left seemingly connected by the flimsy thread of dependence upon Ottoman sovereignty.

Whatever may have been the policy, it has been the practice of the various states adjacent to the Turkish empire to seize upon and to appropriate such portions as they could detach, and either to make them integral parts of their own dominions, or to break up the influence of Turkey by the establishment of independent governments, as in Greece, which blodly and at once threw off the Ottoman yoke—or, as in Wallachia and Moldavia, of protectorship, which more stealthily, but not ess effectually, removed it.

In this course Russia has been by far the most voracious of the vultures that has preyed upon the Ottoman carcase. France has possessed herself of no small share by seizing Algeria; Austria has crept, somewhat sluggishly, but effectively, down the Danubian provinces; and Great Britain, only the other day, for her own convenience, stole Aden, the most important sea port of Arabia.

But suddenly, and as if by magic, all these robber powers turn round, and gravely—ay, gravely—talk of "the independence and integrity of the Ottoman empire." This, as they tell us, is to be the only foundation—this is discovered to be the only sound foundation for the future policy of Europe—"the integrity and independence of the Ottoman empire under the reigning dynasty." This is a principle upon which Europe is agreed; come storm, come sunshine, come darkness, come danger, come what will, for this we are to bargain, for this we are to fight, for this we are to be taxed, for this, if need be, we are to be ruined.

It may be in vain to remind our statesmen that politics, like paupers, have their tattered garments, and that very elaborate patching may but make the rent worse.

Would a wise man undertake to expose the maxims of folly which, under the name of wisdom, have, when adopted as rules for political

guidance, been the cause of discord, delusion, and misery, he would render most acceptable service to the human race. "Balance of power" is one of them—the pregnant mother of mischief, whose last begotten imp is "the integrity and independence of the Ottoman empire."—*Westminster Review.*

Miscellaneous.

A writer in the last Churchman, who signs himself "Corrector," charges the editor of this paper with historical inaccuracy. We shall, as briefly as possible, reply first to his statements, and then add such further observations as seem to us to be called for.

It is said that we have erred in calling Bishop Moore the "first asssistant bishop;" and that we have been misled by the opinion expressed by the consecrating bishops; such opinion not being *law* Let us first see what the consecrating bishops say: "the bishops of this house are ready to consecrate to the office of bishop any person who may be presented," &c. "But this house must be understood to be explicit in their declaration, that they shall consider such a person as *assistant* or coadjutor bishop during Bishop Provoost's life," &c. Now be it remembered, that "the wisdom of the first patriarch, *good old* 'W. W.,'" was here at work, for he was at the head of the consecrators, and from his book we extract the words quoted above. It really does seem to us, that if the "opinions" of Bishops White and Hobart "touching the canonical provisions in the case of a Bishop rejecting an application for orders" are "*authoritative*" as Corrector has said; some little respect is perhaps due to Bishop White's "opinion," that it was right to be "explicit in the declaration" that they considered Bishop Moore an *assistant.*

If our readers take interest enough in this subject to advert to what we wrote under Canon VI., p. 66, of the Record, they will find that we were speaking of the recognition by our bishops of such an office as that of *assistant*, founded on ancient precedents, before we had a canon on the subject. After mentioning the case of Bishop Moore, our words are—"and the prelates of the Church gave their express sanction to the propriety of the ancient practice of the Church which allowed assistant bishops in cases of undoubted necessity." Now suppose Bishop White had been asked, at any time during Bishop Provoost's life, what was the office of Bishop Moore, must he not have answered, 'that of an assistant?' Corrector, then, must assail Bishop White, not us.

But, against the positive declaration of the consecrating bishops that they intended to make Bp. M. an assistant, (and they surely may be presumed to know what they did mean) Corrector adduces the proceedings of the New-York convention to "prove finally and incontestably," that Bishop Moore never was an assistant. If the disposition to attack us had been restrained until our work was done, Corrector might have discovered that, in its proper place, under a future canon, we bring forward these proceedings of New-York, as evidence that the diocese asserted her independent rights, and claimed that Bishop Moore was diocesan. An issue was thus made between the consecrating bishops and the convention of New-York. Those who made the bishop, positively asserting that they made an assistant; and those over whom he ruled, as positively declaring that they elected him diocesan. Admit that he was diocesan, it must still be conceded that his brother bishops looked on him as the *first assistant* bishop the church ever had. Surely, then, it was not an error of such great magnitude on our parts, as Corrector supposes, even if the opinion or vote of the New-York convention be deemed sufficient to settle the question against the bishops. And certainly, whether he was the first or not, has no important bearing on the main point of which we were speaking, viz: the recognition, by our bishops, of assistants in the episcopal office, as being proper.

But Corrector does not seem to be aware of the difficulties of this case, or he would not speak so positively of final and incontestable proof. Whether Bishop Moore were diocesan or assistant is a point about which even now different opinions exist, and if Corrector in his researches into New-York ecclesiastical documents, had turned to Bishop Hobart's own letters of consecration dated May 29, 1811, he would have found that Bishop Provoost was at that time supposed to be a bishop of the church in New-York, for the language used in speaking of the office of Bishop H. is, "to which he hath been elected by the convention of said state to assist the *Bishops* of the church in said state in the duties of the Episcopal office." And this testimonial is signed by bishops White, Provoost, and Jarvis. There are also certain historical facts connected with Bishop Moore's consecration, tending to prove that the delegation from New-York, of whom Bishop (then Mr.) Hobart was one, at the time, understood distinctly that he was consecrated as an assistant, and did not object thereto. We know not whether Corrector is aware of their existence, if not, then he should not be so ready to play Corrector; if he be, then he ought to have avoided such positive assertion on a matter which he knew to be doubtful.

The next case to which we shall advert (and trifling indeed it is) is the statement that we wished to claim the merit of having discovered the applicability of a certain canon to the case of Bishop M'Coskrey's election. This is truly much too small for one who, appreciating labors honestly undertaken for the good of the church, is disposed kindly to aid the toil of the laborer, and to point out errors with friendly feelings. We are not disposed to notice an insinuation like this. It is mere captious fault-finding; we hope it is not prompted by a spirit of personal ill will, which it is felt may be safely indulged under a fictitious signature. We turned over the pages of the "Churchman," as well as of other periodicals throwing light on Bishop M'Coskrey's election; and it is very possible the canon may have been both urged and discussed in what was written there. If so, it escaped our notice, for we recollect having mentioned to the Bishop of New York our surprise that it had not been adverted to. We understood the Bishop to say that he had urged it on his brethren in the Episcopate, in the meetings that were had. Hence we confined our remark to those who *wrote* on the subject. We beg leave to assure "Corrector," that we have no wish to assume what does not belong to us. If he hates us enough to think otherwise, we have only to say that we pray his hatred may not harm him at the last tribunal.

As to the case of the ordination by Bishop Griswold after the refusal by Bishop Hobart, we have briefly spoken of it in our last paper in remarks upon a communication signed "A friend to the memory of Bishop Hobart," which we presume came from the pen of "Corrector." The effort now made by "Corrector," is too obvious to escape even a superficial observer. It is to represent us as *an enemy to Bishop Hobart.* Now it certainly is remarkable that among the many friends of Bishop Hobart to whom we have submitted our manuscript within the last four years (for such is its age) none should ever have supposed that it cast an imputation on the Bishop: but that it should be reserved for "Corrector" to detect it in what we have written. It admits, however, of explanation. No one who read without the determination to find fault wherever he could, but must have seen that all our remarks were directed to the discussion purely of an abstract principle, viz: the policy of a law giving to the act of one bishop power to control the conduct of another. We stated the case that presented this question, and had not the smallest suspicion that any human being would deem our statement personal. We never once thought of accusing Bishop Hobart of anything. To us, it was a matter of no consequence *who* were the two bishops concerned: we should have written as we did, had they been any other two, and should have meant no disrespect to any of them. We read all the documents that "Corrector" has published, and we read too what we are inclined to think "Corrector" has not read, viz: the documents on the other side of the question, for this like every other point of debate has two sides. We knew that Bishop Hobart had spoken of "faults of temper," etc., and we knew that others had spoken differently; and as peace had been restored, we really saw no use in disturbing it. Beside, if moral and religious character were so *certainly* wanting as to make it notoriously bad, we knew that Bishop Griswold would not entertain the application for orders, and could not conscientiously ordain any more than Bishop Hobart could: the question which we were discussing, viz: the independence of our bishops, could not have arisen at all; and yet we knew it did arise, for Bishop Griswold did receive and ordain the candidate We therefore considered that point as not involved, and as we had no disposition to array Bishops Hobart and Griswold against each other, we were thankful that subsequent circumstances rendered it in our view unnecessary.

We proceed now to offer our authority, for our statements. We shall first present our assertions, and then under each the proof we used.

"He left the medical profession to become a candidate for orders in the diocese of New York, and was duly received by Bishop Hobart as a candidate."

"During the greater part of a year he was a candidate in the diocese of New-York."—*Bishop Griswold's address to the Convention of the Eastern Diocese, September* 25, 1823.

"Afterward Bishop Hobart thought it to be his duty to decline ordaining him."

"I received an official notification from the bishop of that diocese [New York,] that he had refused to give Mr. D—— orders.—*Bishop Griswold, same address.*

"Of the reasons which led the bishop to pursue this course, it is not necessary *for our purpose* now to speak; though the refusal was not on grounds affecting his moral or religious character."

"Mr. D—— produced abundant testimonials to his talents, piety, good morals, and respectability of character. The ground on which he had been rejected was violence of temper and his having used language injurious to the character of individuals. Some instances of this not to be justified, were produced; but not in the judgment of our Standing Committee, to a degree which ought to

debar him from being admitted as a candidate for the ministry in this diocese."—*Bishop Griswold, same address.*

Upon the refusal of Bishop Hobart to ordain him, he applied to the Standing Committee of Rhode Island, to be received as a candidate.

"He applied to the Standing Committee of the State of Rhode Island, requesting to be admitted as a candidate here."—*Bishop Griswold, same address.*

"Bishop Griswold, to whose jurisdiction that diocese belonged, wrote to Bishop Hobart informing him of the application, and requesting from him a statement of the objections against the applicant's receiving orders."

"I had previously written to the Bishop of New York, informing him of Mr. D——s application to this diocese and requesting a statement of the objections against his receiving orders."—*Bishop Griswold, some address.*

"Before this, however, Bishop Hobart had given to his brother prelates official notification of his refusal to ordain."

"I received an official notification from the bishop of that diocese, that he had refused to give Mr. D—— orders."—*Bishop Griswold, same address.*

"In reply to Bishop Griswold's letter, he received from Bishop Hobart a long, particular and very friendly answer."

"A long, particular and very friendly answer was promptly returned."—*Bishop Griswold, same address.*

"All this correspondence was laid by Bishop Griswold before the Standing Committee of Rhode Island."

"This corespondence has also been laid before the Standing Committee."—*Bishop Griswold, same address.*

"That body" consisting of eight respetcable and judicious members, "all met in council on this difficult and interesting question, and gave it" says Bishop Griswold, whom we quote, "a faithful examination."

"That Standing Committee, consisting of eight respectable and judicious members all met in council on this difficult and interesting question and gave it, I have good reason to believe, a faithful examination.—*Bishop Griswold, same address.*

"The Committee did not think there were sufficient grounds to prevent their recommendation of him *as a candidate*, and they recommended him accordingly, seven out of eight members of the Committee signed his testimonials."

"He was accordingly recommended: seven of the Committee signed his testimonials. He is not ordained, but received *as other candidates*, on probation.—*Bishop Griswold, same address.*

"The case was one involving a practical question of so much importance, that it was much discussed; and as the General Convention met not long after its occurrence, the opinion of the House of Bishops was informally requested with reference to this case. Bishop Griswold was present, and after hearing what was said by his brother bishops on the subject, was rather confirmed, as he states, in the view which he had taken of the case."

"During the sitting of the last General Convention, with reference to this case, the opinion of the House of Bishops was requested." From what was said on the subject, I was the rather inclined to the course which I have since pursued."—*Bp. Griswold. Same address.*

"The opinions on each side, seem to have been respectively as follows:—In opposition to the reception by one bishop of a candidate who had been rejected by another, it was said that it violated the comity which should exist between brother bishops of the same church; and such reception seemed to reflect upon the rejecting bishop as having been guilty of unreasonable severity and tyranny; that it was in fact sitting in judgment upon his official conduct without affording him the benefit of a full trial; and that it would seem to be useless for the canon to require, as it did, that a rejecting bishop should give notice to all his brethren of an act of rejection on his part, if any of them were at liberty immediately to receive the candidate."

For this, our authority may be seen in the letter of Bishop Hobart, as published by "Corrector."

"On the other hand it was said, that there certainly was no express canonical prohibition, whereby a bishop was prevented from receiving as a candidate, one who had been refused in another diocese."

"Our canons in such case do not prohibit an application elsewhere,"—*Bp. Griswold. Same address.*

"That if exclusion by one bishop was to be conclusive against the candidate, it made that one bishop, *quoad hoc*, dictator to the rest of his brethren, and leagalized in some degree the interference of one bishop with the diocesan affairs of another jurisdiction."

"I am not called, nor am I authorized to judge of the principles, or character, or official conduct of another bishop. My part in this business is not to decide whether Mr. D—— ought to have been ordained in another diocese, but whether he may with propriety be received as a candidate in this."—*Bishop Griswold. Same address.*

"It would lead to this greater evil of admitting that the authority in one diocese may interfere in, and obstruct the business of another. When a bishop has dismissed a candidate and canonically given his reasons for refusing him orders, he has then, in regard to himself, finished the business.—*Bishop Griswold. Address to the Convention of of the Eastern Diocese in* 1824.

"That to receive in one diocese a man who had been refused in another, did not necessarily imply censure or disapprobation of the bishop who had rejected him, for (moral and religious character being unassailed,) there might be reasons for refusing in one diocese, which would not be of equal weight in another."

"The chief objection to this proceeding which has come to my knowledge is that it may be viewed as an indirect censure upon the ecclesiastical authority which had before refused orders:—it can no more justly be considered as a censure or even disapprobation of what was done in New-York, than a difference of opinion between any two gentlemen;—because circumstances may render it inexpedient to ordain him in the one diocese which do not exist in the other.—*Bishop Griswold. Same address as last quoted.*

"That a very important distinction obtained between the case of one who applied to be received *as a candidate* and thus if successful, was put upon probation; and one who applied *for orders*, upon his candidateship in another diocese, after having been there refused."

If Mr. D—— were now ordained on the score of his being or having been a candidate in the other diocese, the case would be materially different; but as the case is, he is received on trial, and, like other candidates, to be ordained or not as he is found worthy."—*Ep. Griswold. Address of* 1823.

"That as to the notice required by the canon from a bishop who rejected, to his brother bishops, its purpose was not to settle the question, but to put them on their guard, to induce inquiry on their parts, of the rejecting bishop into the causes why the candidate should not be received."

"Our canons evidently allow, and a just regard to the rights of men requires, that a person who has been refused orders in one diocese, may be ordained in another. It is only made necessary, before he is received as a candidate, to ascertain and duly consider the reasons for which he was refused. If these reasons as far as they can be ascertained, do not amount to what (in the diocese to which the second application is made,) is in other cases a disqualification, they ought not in my judgment to be so deemed in this."—*Bishop Griswold's address of* 1824.

"That to let each case be judged upon its own merits, best sustained the great principles, of the perfect equality of our bishops, was attended with little or no danger, as all the bishops had a common object in keeping out bad men, and that in the very few cases in which differences of opinion would at last exist, no censure would be implied, for it would be but the common instance of one court judging differently from another, upon the same state of facts."

"The history of the Church in ages past must be surely sufficient to teach us the importance of maintaining the just power and equal independence of each diocese, and of allowing no paramount authority but that which is voluntarily delegated for the common good."—*Bishop Griswold's address of* 1824.

"Let it be duly considered that human judgment is not infallible; and all men are liable to err; and that nothing is more common than differences of opinion when circumstances do not differ. And who cannot see that two Standing Committees or two bishops may judge differently of facts, or qualifications or expediency, without either intending or causing any manner of censure."—*Bishop Griswold. Address of* 1824.

"That men should differ in judgment is one of the most common things in life. A number of judges who hear a cause with the same evidence of facts, and the same arguments of counsel before them, are often in their decisions divided: each one acts conscientiously according to his own best judgment, without designing or even thinking of any censure upon the opinions of those who judge differently."—*Bishop Griswold. Address of* 1823.

"And even admitting it to be censure, it was said to be better to inflict censure upon a bishop who deserved it, than to perpetuate injustice to uphold his dignity."

"We might indeed add that admitting the objection were correct and well founded, the apprehension that another *might be censured* would be no good reason for refusing to *do justly*"—*Bishop Griswold. Address of* 1824.

"It was also said to be a great hardship and an invasion of the fair rights of a man, to refuse him absolutely all possibility of obtaining orders, upon the partial decision of one bishop."

"A just regard to the rights of men requires that a person who has been refused orders in one diocese, may be ordained in another."—*Bishop Griswold, same address.*

"To reject an applicant in such cases would evidently be unjust."—*Ibid.*

"In such cases a man ought to be allowed to ad-

peal to an unprejudiced bishop for a fair decision on his merits."

"We cannot forbear from expressing the wish that a canon may be passed providing for a right of appeal in all cases in which a presbyter, deacon or lay reader may consider himself as aggrieved by the decision of his bishop. Such a right of appeal existed by canon law in the ancient church, in the case of a presbyter feeling himself aggrieved; and we see not why it should not be extended so as to embrace the present subject of discussion."—*Extracted from remarks on the case of Mr. D., made by members of Bishop Griswold's Convention, and published in the Gospel Advocate for* 1824.

In conclusion, it should be remarked that Bishop Griswold expressed himself as being fully aware of the importance of this case as establishing a *precedent*; and therefore he bestowed upon it no trifling attention. So far as it is a precedent, the canon of 1832 sustains it, for it does not introduce any prohibition.

"I speak brethren the more particularly in this case, because it is in some respects a novel one and may become a precedent."—*Bishop Griswold. Address of* 1824.

The reader has now before him the evidence on which we proceeded in every assertion we made. We have, however, one other item of testimony. It is contained in a letter from Bishop Griswold which he kindly sent to us in reply to one we addressed to him, asking if we had misrepresented the truth of this case.

Boston, Feb. 17th, 1841.

Rev. and Dear Sir,—Your statement of the case of Dr. D., in the 11th number of the Church Record, is, so far as I can now recollect, (for I have not the documents before me, nor could I easily come at them,) correct and fair. Bishop H. and myself differed in opinion respecting the obligations imposed by the Canon, and the principles involved in the case. But that difference, so far as I know, never, in any degree, diminished the brotherly friendship and good feeling between us. He no doubt thought that I erred, and in a manner with which I was not at all displeased, gave his reasons for so thinking. I claim no exemption from the common frailty of our nature. I am liable to err, but I endeavored to do right, and my reasons for what I did, I made public. How the public judged of it, I was never at any pains to make inquiry. My own view of the case has not since been changed. A similar case happened soon after; one who was refused being received as a candidate by the Standing Committee in Rhode Island (but not for any reason affecting his moral or religious character) was ordained in Virginia.

Dr. D. mentioned to me, with great satisfaction, the very kind manner in which Bishop H. afterward met and frankly treated him.

There may have been facts in that case of which I never had knowledge, or which I have since forgotten, but, as I said above, I can discover no unfairness in what you have published. In regard to the "preponderance of opinion in the Church," I have nothing to say, nor indeed do I know. Bishop H's. friends, of whom deservedly he had very many, no doubt believed then, and believe still, that I was in the wrong. "With me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of man's judgment." I endeavor certainly to be cautious how "I judge mine own self." Except where the good of the church or of religion require it, my general rule has been to avoid all controversy.

With sentiments of respect and esteem, very affectionately your friend and brother,

Alex. V. Griswold.

As to preponderance of opinion in the church in favor of perfect independence of our bishops, we expressed an opinion which we still entertain, that the church by not having legislated to interfere with it deem it best to leave it as it is. If so, it sanctions the principle on which Bishop Griswold acted. Such at least is our view, and we quarrel with no man who differs from us.

And now may we be permitted to advert to one passage in the communication of "Corrector," not because it contains a contemptuous sneer at ourselves, (for we really care nothing for it,) but to point out a principle assumed by "Corrector," which we think dangerous. He calls the opinion of Bishops White and Hobart on the canonical provisions touching rejected candidates "*authoritative* opinions." If authoritative they are binding. On whom? Only on bishops can they be binding, for they tie the hands of no one else: and yet we see the present presiding bishop was not fettered by them: the Bishop of Virginia in the case mentioned in Bishop Griswold's letter was not bound by them. Is it not plain that if the interpretation of a canon by one bishop has the force of authority, an opposite interpretation by another bishop must also be authority, unless we destroy parity among our bishops?—and thus we have conflicting authorities in the church. It were easy to quote "Correctors" own words against himself by substituting merely Bishop Griswold's name for those of Bishops White and Hobart, and instead of "Church Record" reading "Corrector." Thus would it run: we really mean not to retort the sneer, but to make more prominent a dangerous fallacy:—

"The authoritative opinions, also, thus furnished of Bishop [Griswold,] touching the canonical provisions in the case of a Bishop rejecting an application for orders, will, of course, be highly prized by all who would form a just and enlightened opinion respecting the true meaning, intent, and bearing, of such provisions; however such opinion may differ from that of ["Corrector."]

No, no. Thank Heaven, we have not yet reached that crisis when the mere opinion of a bishop, on a point so far from being settled that even bishops themselves do not agree upon it, is to be deemed final authority; so that a man who belongs to the church and honestly loves it, is to be precluded from even expressing an opinion.

Now we have the sincerest respect for the memories of both the excellent bishops named by Corrector, and we are sure they never would have claimed for their opinions the authoritative force imputed to them. In this case, indeed, Bishop White was not acting in a matter that concerned his own episcopate at all. He was resorted to for advice because wisdom and piety made him a sound counsellor. Bishop Griswold was forced by his position to act, and Corrector must not suppose that Bishop White's opinion was disregarded. What says Bishop Griswold about it. "The presiding bishop, whose opinion is always highly and very justly esteemed, stated in writing his view of the general question; but not in such terms or under such supposed circumstances, as, in my apprehension, to include the present case. In all the cases he put, it was supposed that the second bishop applied to is to be a judge of the other's conduct; he views it as "predicating an ordination on the ground of the unreasonable severity, and, as it would be termed, tyranny of another bishop." In such a case, my judgment would coincide with his. But such is not my view of the present case."

As regards, then, our first error touching the fact of Bishop Moore's being an assistant, we leave Corrector, with his professed respect for the "authoritative opinions" of bishops, to settle the matter with good Bishop White and the other consecrators; and as to our last, we leave him to settle that with the present presiding bishop. He is at variance with them all.

But for what purpose we venture to ask is this attack upon us? Why are we to be, even if guilty of historical inaccuracy, thus publicly assailed? Why the gratuitous insinuation that we meant to injure Bishop Hobart? Is it part of a preconcerted system to do us injury? It is not long since (as we are told by friends,) that we were charged with being what is termed "a low churchman;" and now, we are represented as the enemy of Bishop Hobart. We are thankful that our own columns at last afford us the opportunity of speaking for ourselves. With "low churchmen," *as a party*, we have not and never had any communication or sympathy. For many of the gentlemen of that party, however, we entertain cordial respect and affection. We esteem them for their piety and appreciate their talents. A difference of opinion on certain general questions of church policy exists between us, and this has often and publicly been avowed by us; but we freely confess our views of what become a "high churchman," or a gentleman, never led us to suppose that it was our duty to look on fellow christians as wanting in every virtue that ennobles man, merely because they do not in all particulars think precisely as we do. We respectfully beg leave, therefore, to meet what we must deem an unworthy attempt to injure, by arousing prejudice, and we will do it by stating what our view of a *consistent* "high church" clergyman is; we are happy to think we know many such, though of late they may have been denounced, because they will not learn to prononnce the modern shibboleth of party, devised by some who usurp to themselves the prerogative of dictating a new test of churchmanship.

"On the doctrines of the *cross* then he takes his stand, endeavoring to preach them in the simplicity and sincerity of a heart that feels them, and with the earnestness of a man who wishes to save his own soul and the souls of others." What are these doctrines? "The entire spiritual death, and alienation of man from God, by the entertainment of sin; the reconciliation of God to the world, by the sufferings and death of his only begotten son; the atonement of his blood; justification by faith; acceptance through the merits of the Saviour; conversion of the heart to God; holiness of life, the only evidence of it, and the grace of God in the renewal of the Holy Ghost, the sole agent from first to last in working out our salvation from sin here and from hell hereafter. In fewer words, "*salvation* by grace, through faith, not of works, lest any man should boast."

But with these vital and heaven-blessed doctrines, other points of edification require attention; particularly that of the distinctive character of the Church. On this a most lamentable ignorance prevails; and to permit this ignorance to continue undisturbed, is to be false to ordination vows, to acknowledged principles, to the interests of the church, and to the souls committed to the pastor's care."

This is an outline of the high Church principles which we avow. We learned them many years ago in an unexceptionable school, before some who would now dictate and anathematize, knew what the church meant. To the maintenance of those principles we have consecrated for more than half our life, all we had: for these be the principles, expressed in the words of our good old father, and teacher, and friend, Bishop Ravenscroft. It was in his school we learned our churchmanship, and we think that the church at this day cannot afford us any wiser or more honest teacher.

A word now as to Bishop Hobart. So strong is the regard for his memory, that it is difficult to find for a clergyman here a shorter road to contumely and suspicious distrust, not to say disgrace, than to represent him as opposed to Bishop Hobart. We honor and respect his memory, and therefore are glad of this opportunity to put on record our opinion of his worth. To a noble frankness of disposition

he added an intuitive perception of character and a fearlessness that never shunned danger in the cause of truth. Ardent in temperament, he was formed for action, though his strong manly sense fitted him also for counsel. His sincere piety was placed beyond all doubt. To the enlargement and prosperity of that church of which he was a distinguished ornament, he consecrated all his powers He did more than any man of his day to make known, defend and establish what we believe to be true views of the nature and constitution of the christian ministry. To his labors, we religiously believe, is it chiefly owing that at this day, Episcopacy is so firmly fixed in the affections of the clergy of our communion: (for we at least, have never found one, high or low, who would surrender it.) With these views we indignantly repel either assertion or insinuation, we care not whence they may come, that would represent us as wanting in respect for the memory of Bishop Hobart. But let it not be supposed that we bow down with *blind* respect.

There is a class, to which we freely confess we do not belong, that deems it treason to the church to think that Bishop Hobart could err: a class composed of those, ever ready to swell the train that waits on the possessor of great and commanding qualities; and, in the absence of merit of their own, to shine with a borrowed radiance reflected from the splendour of their master. For them we feel no emotion but pity.

Bishop Hobart had the infirmities of human nature, but his errors were so small compared with his excellencies, that few men can better afford to have the existence of those errors mentioned. They sprang from the noble traits of his character; deduct them all, and there will still remain an immense amount of what was great and good; more than sufficient to redeem ten times over his errors. For what were those errors? Faults of the heart? No; but the occasional mistakes of judgment incident to the wisest of men; and remarkable for the fact that they were not produced by the selfishness that ordinarily causes such mistakes. Bishop Hobart might err in judgment under the impulse of ardent zeal for the extension of the *Church*, but no man can charge him with being misled by views of personal aggrandizement or benefit. These are our opinions of that distinguished man, and we have thus written them down, because, however humble our position, self-respect, will not permit us to be classed, by some unknown writer, among the enemies of such a man. Of his general course of policy, we heartily approve; of some of his official acts we do not. We have not assailed his motives in the transaction commented on by the contributor to the Churchman; nay, we have not even called in question his judgment, for we have scrupulously avoided as unnecessary to our purpose the grounds for opinions entertained by the one bishop or the other as to the candidate. We solemnly declare that at this moment, we really know not all the particulars of the dispute. We never deemed it necessary to our purpose to know them.

But what if we had, in respectful terms, intimated what we deemed an error of judgment in a public, official act? Has it indeed come to this, that a man must be denounced as a criminal and be made the victim of prejudice, because he ventures to utter an independent opinion? Must all be condemned who think that Bishop Hobart could sometimes err? Is such a thought disrespect to his memory? Be it so then; but let *all* the culprits be arraigned; and we begin with the highest in station. Has not the present bishop of the diocese, in an official communication touching the relinquishment of the ministry by Mr. Harrison, stated that at the time of such relinquishment, he, being then a presbyter, doubted whether Bishop Hobart had not errred by non-compliance with the canon made for such cases? Is this disrespect?

When the testimonials of the Assistant Bishop of Virginia were before the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, though it was well known that Bishop Hobart was in favor of the consecration, did not the present bishop, sitting as a presbyter in the lower house, vote against the consecration and decline signing the testimonials? Yes, for we sat by his side, and, with all the rest of the delegation from Connecticut, on constitutional grounds, did the same thing. Was this disrespect?

When Bishop Hobart proposed in the House of Bishops, what was termed "an alteration of the liturgy," did not the present bishop with every other high churchman in the lower house feel opposition to the measure? Was this disrespect?

When Bishop Hobart by his pastoral letter, denounced "the clerical association" in the city of New York, some ten or twelve years since, did not the clergyman, who now is editor of the "Churchman," and who (as we are informed,) belonged to that association, in common with all the other members, think that Bishop Hobart erred? Did he not join in the statement published by the members in answer to the pastoral letter? Was this disrespect?

Nay, when Bishop Hobart himself, virtually withdrew by declining to urge his proposal for "an alteration of the liturgy" of which we have spoken above, did he treat himself with disrespect? No, for there never lived the man who would more nobly acknowledge and retract what he supposed to be an error. It was not a duty indeed that *he* was often called on to perform, but when he was, it was ever done with the graceful dignity of a gentleman, and the frank honesty of a christian.

But enough of this *ad captandum* cry of "respect for the memory of Bishop Hobart."

A word or two more, and we trespass no longer on the time of our readers. It is usual, and deemed but an act of ordinary courtesy to tender in good faith friendly aid to one engaged in a work like ours. It is a work of toil and one in which the most honest man may fall into undesigned mistakes. We claim no exemption from the common infirmities of our kind. We can fearlessly appeal to Him who knoweth the heart, for the truth of our declaration, that our task was undertaken, and has been prosecuted in love to the Church, and with the hope of doing her some little service. We have written for no party. We have wished, as far as the truth would let us, to present the Church to those who are to come after us, not as perpetually distracted by contention and strife within her own bosom; but in the spirit of conciliation, and peace, and charity toward all her children, our aim has been to show the great steps of her onward progress to her present condition. In the commencement of this very treatise on the Constitution and Canons, we have with perfect sincerity disclaimed all idea of dictation, and declared that we assumed not for our labors the force of authority. Was it or is it then too much to expect friendly assistance from our brethren, instead of public accusation, charging us in effect with either wilfully or ignorantly falsifying the truth? A kind private letter pointing out errors real or supposed would always command our gratitude and respect. Some such we have and we shall thankfully avail ourselves of them hereafter. In this case such a letter would have been doubly acceptable, because it would have spared pain to a brother clergyman, who, whatever may have been *our* fault, was guiltless, and therefore entitled, we think, to more delicate regard to *his* feelings than is shown in the revival after eighteen years of an unhappy dispute that had been settled by the parties as Christians. We can truly say that the knowledge of his feelings on this occasion has given us more pain than any thing else in the transaction. We know not who Corrector is, we have taken no pains to discover, we shall take none. It might make us feel more unkindly than we desire to do toward a fellow creature, and therein might do injury to our own peace of mind and Christian comfort. We love peace and eschew controversy: and we doubt not that it will gratify our friends, perhaps disappoint our enemies, to hear us say, that as our paper was not established for the purpose of quarrelling with any one, we shall endeavor to avoid controversy, however strong the effort may be to provoke it; and when obliged to speak, we shall endeavor by God's grace to speak with Christian forbearance and moderation.

To the Editor of the Church Record.

REV. AND DEAR SIR:—

Please to inform your correspondent, "John Smith," that the Bishop of Maryland, has never written himself "Bishop of the Catholic Church in Maryland," as he has seen it incorrectly stated Perhaps that gentleman, knowing of but one Bishop in a diocese, sees no occasion to write himself Bishop of *this*, *that*, or *the other* Church. W.

☞ The communication of "Clericus" is in type, but unavoidably omitted for want of room. This is also the case with a document from the Rev. Mr. Verren. They will appear in our next.

☞ A Sermon will be preached, on Sunday evening February 28th, by the Rev. Mr. Haight, in the Mission Church of the Holy Evangelists, Vandewater street, for the benefit of the Infant School connected with that Church.

Should the weather prove unfavorable on the evening of the 28th, the sermon will be postponed until the following Sunday evening.

Acknowledgements.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL EDUCATION AND MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

The Treasurer acknowledges the receipt of the following sums, viz:

From Annual Subscribers, $12. From St. Thomas' Church, N. Y, $1 25, and from a gentleman of same Church to be added to collection of 24th ultimo, for missionary fund, $18.* Total amount of receipts $31 25.

C. N. S. ROWLAND,
Feb'y 16, 1841. *Treasurer, 55 Water st.*

* These amounts added makes the amount of contributions by St. Thomas' Church, N. Y., to the missionary fund, $500 59.

YOUNG MEN'S AUXILIARY EDUCATION AND MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

The Treasurer has received since his last acknowledgment—From the children of St Thomas' Church Sunday School, $15. F. A. Hanford, $1. B. R. Winthrop, $5. C. A. Focke, $15. J. E. Johnson, $2. A. T. Canfield, $1. Rev. Mr. Evans, $2. J. S. Aspinwall, $6.

By Geo. H. Bell—sundry subscriptions, $10. By W. A. Duncan, cash $1. From A. V. Blake, $2. Two subscriptions, $2. By C. C. Hoffman, from F. W. Dominick, jr., $10. Sundry subscriptions, $13. By Dr. Hobart, sundry subscriptions, $12. By J. R. Van Rensellaer, $12. By G. R. Fleming, $6. Total amount, 115.

CHARLES TOMES, *Treasurer.*
New-York, February 16, 1841.

PRINTED AT
ST. THOMAS' HALL PRESS:
BY CHARLES R. LINCOLN.